

**REMARKS**

**Foreign Priority:**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging Applicant's claim to foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d), and for confirming that the certified copy of the priority document has been received at the Patent Office.

**Drawings:**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that the drawings filed March 6, 2002 have been approved.

**Information Disclosure Statement:**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for initialing and returning Form PTO/SB/08 A & B filed on November 12, 2003, thus indicating that all of the references listed thereon have been considered.

**Allowable Subject Matter:**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 1 and 2 have been allowed, and that although claim 7 has been objected to, this claim would also be allowable if written in independent form.

**Claim Rejections:**

Claims 1-7 are all of the claims pending in the present application, and currently claims 3-6 stand rejected.

***35 U.S.C. § 112, 1<sup>st</sup> Paragraph Rejection - Claims 3-5:***

Claims 3-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph as containing subject matter not specifically defined in the application as filed.

As an initial matter, Applicant notes that although the Examiner has indicated that claims 3-6 stand rejected, Applicant submits that this rejection applies only to claims 3-5, as claim 6 is an independent claim. Applicant proceeds under this presumption.

In rejecting claims 3-5, the Examiner asserts that there is no disclosure of the “retaining portion” set forth in claim 3. To show this, the Examiner relies on Figures 12 and 13, and asserts that these Figures, along with their corresponding discussions, show no “retaining portion.”

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner. Specifically, the present application states that the terminals of the present invention contain projecting portions 25c, and that these “projecting portions 25c” are retained in the positioning holes 34a. *See* Specification, page 27, 1<sup>st</sup> full paragraph. This is also depicted in the non-limiting exemplary embodiment shown in Figure 9, where the portion 25c projects into the walls of the positioning hole 34a, and the portion 25c has both an upper and lower surface.

In view of at least this disclosure, Applicant submits that the claimed “retaining portion” is sufficiently described and set forth in the present application, such that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that Applicants were possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed. Therefore, Applicant hereby requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the above 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph rejection of these claims.

Further, as there is no pending prior art rejection of these claims, Applicant also submits that these claims are now allowable, with claims 1 and 2.

***35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Rejection - Claim 6:***

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Quillet reference (previously applied). In view of the following discussion, Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejection.

As an initial matter, Applicant notes that the Examiner has provided a marked up Figure 3, of Quillet, as an attachment to the office action. In this attachment, the Examiner asserts that the portion shown circled (by the item #31) is a “wide flat portion,” as claimed in the present application.

However, for at least the same reasons set forth in the previous response (filed September 29, 2004), Applicant disagrees with the Examiner. In light of the Examiner maintaining this rejection, as well as providing a marked up attachment, Applicant has again carefully reviewed the Quillet reference and has found no indication that the terminal 3 is a flat-widened terminal.

As previously indicated, Figures 2 and 3, of Quillet, disclose a bent terminal 3. However, contrary to the Examiner’s assertions there is no disclosure of the terminals having a wide-flat portion formed by being bent at an intermediate portion of the terminal. Applicant has reviewed Quillet in detail and has found no reference of the terminal having a wide-flat portion. In fact, as indicated previously, the terminals 3 are simply round terminals. Thus, for at least this reason, Applicant submits that Quillet fails to anticipate the claimed invention.

As argued previously, Quillet relates to an insulation, and the terminal of Quillet has a circular shape because the terminal is not considered a heat release. Stated differently, the terminal of Quillet is not being used to dissipate heat passing through or via the terminal.

Because the terminal is not being used as a heat release there is no need to increase the surface area of the terminal. Thus, the terminal in Quillet is circular in cross-section. It is well known that to increase heat transfer or dissipation the surface area of the contact surfaces should be increased to increase the rate of heat transfer. However, because Quillet is not directed to this and the terminals are not used to dissipate heat, they are round and do not have wide-flat portions.

Contrary to Quillet, the terminal of the claimed invention has the flat portion to be in contact with other portion for the heat release aspects of this portion. The flat portion causes high efficiency of the heat release. Therefore, Quillet fails to disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention.

Moreover, even if the Examiner wishes to ignore Applicant's arguments regarding the heat transfer aspects of the Quillet, Applicant notes that this does not change the fact that Quillet provides no discussion or disclosure regarding the shape of the terminal at the area in question. Further, the Examiner's speculation as to the shape in Quillet is insufficient to show that Quillet anticipates the claimed invention, as each element must be expressly or inherently present in the reference. This is simply not the case here.

In view of the foregoing discussion, Applicant submits that Quillet fails to disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention. Therefore, Quillet fails to anticipate the claimed invention, as required under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Accordingly, Applicant hereby requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the above 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of the claim 6.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.116  
Application No. 10/091,183


Our Ref: Q68816  
Art Unit: 2833

**Conclusion:**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Terrance J. Wikberg  
Registration No. 47,177

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 19, 2005